



Application No. 10/694,828  
Attorney Docket No. 12480-000023/US

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 7 and 10. Please replace the original sheets with the attachments.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 16 are amended by this response. Claims 2, 6, 9, 12 and 14 were withdrawn in response to a Restriction Requirement. Claims 1, 5, 9-11 and 16 are independent.

**Drawings**

In the Office Action mailed September 26, 2006, the drawings were objected because of minor informalities. In response to this objection, replacement sheets of drawings are submitted herewith, which correct the informalities identified by the Examiner. In particular, the text “TEST COMAND LIST” is replaced with “TEST COMMAND LIST” in the block labeled with reference character 36a in figure 7, and figure 10 is amended to include a “CONVENTIONAL ART” label.

In light of the replacement sheets of drawings, Applicants respectfully request that the drawing objections be withdrawn.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1, 5, 11 and 16 were objected to as including various minor informalities identified at page 3, paragraphs 6-8 of the Office Action mailed September 26, 2006. In response to these claim objections, claims 1, 5, 11 and 16 are amended as suggest by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1, 5, 11 and 16 be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as detailed below.

**Claims 4, 8, 13 and 15**

Regarding claims 4, 8, 13 and 15, the Examiner asserts that the language “minimum unit” is unclear. Accordingly, claims 4, 8, 13 and 15 are amended to specify that the “minimum unit” recited in claims 4, 8, 13 and 15 is image information of “1 x 1 pixel” or “2 x 2 pixels.” Support for this amendment to claims 4, 8, 13 and 15 is found in the Applicants’ specification at least from page 18, line 4 to page 19, line 2.

**Claim 10**

Regarding claim 10, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear if the claim is directed to a testing device or a display device. Accordingly, the preamble of claim 10 is amended to clarify that claim 10 is directed to a testing device.

**Claims 11 and 16**

Regarding claims 11 and 16, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear if the claims 11 and 16 are directed to a recording medium or a testing device. Accordingly, claims 11 and 16 are amended to clarify that claims 11 and 16 are directed to a recording medium storing executable instructions, which when executed cause a display device to perform a method related to testing the display device.

**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Braun (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,470 B2) Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Braun is directed to self-testing video display device and methods thereof. Braun at column 3, lines 53-61 indicates that the video display device 100 includes a video receiver/encoder 113 that “includes a processor 117 that performs a variety of operations including execution of the test program or diagnostic procedures.” A flow chart for a diagnostic procedure is illustrated in FIG. 4 of Braun. The Examiner appears to rely on the test program and/or diagnostic procedures described in Braun to anticipate the test sequence and related features of the independent claims.

However, Applicants respectfully note that Braun does not disclose that the display device described in Braun is capable of operating in full display mode and/or a partial display mode, much less that the test programs and/or diagnostic procedures described in Braun may be used to change a display device to change from operating in a full display mode to a partial display mode.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Braun at least fails to disclose, teach or suggest “means for changing between a full display mode and a partial display mode during the test sequence,” as recited in amended independent claim 1, or the somewhat similar features of amended independent claims 5, 9-11 and 16. Because Braun fails to disclose all of the features of the independent claims, Braun also fails to disclose all of the features of the dependent claims.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 4, 8, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Braun in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,011). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kim also fails to disclose, teach or suggest a device changing between full display mode and a partial display mode during a test sequence and thus, fails to cure the deficiencies Of Braun described above with respect to independent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 4, 8, 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

**Rejoinder of Withdrawn Claims**

Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11 and 16 are still generic. Accordingly, if one of these claims is allowed the withdrawn claims should be rejoined and allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections, and allowance the pending claims of this application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By: *Ray Hyl- Pg # 41, 060*  
Donald J. Daley  
Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, VA 20195  
(703) 668-8000

DJD/SAE/ame